

de novo review of the record may be dispensed with.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). De novo review is also not required “when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Id.* Similarly, when no objection is filed, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, advisory committee note).

III. DISCUSSION

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a district court judge shall make a de novo determination of any portion of an M&R to which specific written objection has been made. A party’s failure to make a timely objection is accepted as an agreement with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). No objection to the M&R having been filed, and the time for doing so having passed, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issue covered in the M&R. Nevertheless, this Court has conducted a review of the M&R and other documents of record and, having done so, hereby finds that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is, in all respects, in accordance with the law and should be approved. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

In adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation, the Court dismisses all remaining claims against the Town of Lilesville. Therefore, the only claims currently pending in this action are those against Kevin Mullis in his individual capacity, and, as the Magistrate Judge noted, (Doc. No. 144, at 20), “it appears those claims would be subject to dismissal for the same reasons” that Greene’s claims against the Town of Lilesville are dismissed. Accordingly, Greene


must respond, in writing, by **Friday, September 22, 2023**, to show cause as to why his remaining claims against Mullis should not also be dismissed.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. The Magistrate Judge's M&R, (Doc. No. 144), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendant Town of Lilesville's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, (Doc. No. 122), is **GRANTED**; and
3. Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to respond, in writing, by **Friday, September 22, 2023**, to show cause as to why his remaining claims against Mullis should not also be dismissed.

Signed: August 29, 2023



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
United States District Judge

